

REMARKS

I. Introduction

Claims 22 to 45 and 51 to 53 are pending in the present application. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable, and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

II. Rejection of Claims 22 to 30, 39, 43, 44, and 51 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 22 to 30, 39, 43, 44, and 51 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of U.S. Patent No. 6,198,168 (“Geusic et al.”), U.S. Patent No. 6,207,903 (“Wen et al.”), and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0072130 (“Tsang et al.”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Tsang et al. does not render unpatentable these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claim 22, which relates to an electrical component, recites, inter alia, that at least one feedthrough that includes one of a right prism and a right oval cylinder. Regarding this feature, the Final Office Action contends at page 5 that Tsang et al. discloses an oval cylinder. In particular, the Final Office Action asserts that via 12 of Figure 6 is an oval cylinder, and further points to the disclosure of the cylinder being disclosed as having a diameter. However, there is absolutely no disclosure in Tsang et al. of a right oval cylinder. Rather, the cylinder disclosed by Tsang et al. has a circular cross-section. Figure 6, which is an orthographic illustration, appears consistent with a cylinder having a circular cross-section, rather than an oval cross-section. Further, the detailed description of Tsang et al. describes the shape of the vias in terms of a single inner diameter and a single outer diameter. See para. [0044]. Thus, it is plainly apparent that the cylindrical geometry of vias is circular rather than oval. Indeed, Tsang et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, a feedthrough that includes at least one of a right prism and a right oval cylinder.

As set forth above, Tsang et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, at least one feedthrough that includes one of a right prism and a right oval cylinder, as recited in claim 22. Geusic et al. and Wen et al. also do not disclose, or even suggest, this feature. As such, the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Tsang et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features of claim 22 and

therefore do not render unpatentable claim 22 or any claim that depends from claim 22.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully disagree with the assertion at page 5 of the Final Office Action that providing an oval cylinder would be “an obvious matter of design choice.” In this regard, it is entirely unclear how providing an oval cylinder could be considered “a mere change in the size of a component” as asserted at page 5 of the Final Office Action. For example, merely changing the size of a cylinder having a circular cross-section would result in a larger or smaller cylinder having a circular cross-section. There does not appear to be any way that “a mere change in the size” of a circular cylinder could lead to an oval cylinder. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Tsang et al. does not render unpatentable claims 28 and 29 for this additional reason.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

III. Rejection of Claims 32 and 33 to 36 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 32 and 33 to 36 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Tsang et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,926,377 (“Nakao et al.”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Tsang et al., and Nakao et al. does not render unpatentable these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 32 and 33 to 36 ultimately depend from claim 22 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 22. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Tsang et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 22. Nakao et al. is not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Tsang et al. Indeed, Nakao et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Tsang et al.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Tsang et al., and Nakao et al. does not render unpatentable the present claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

IV. Rejection of Claims 37 and 38 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 37 and 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Tsang et al., Nakao et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,312,765 (“Kanber”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Tsang et al., Nakao et al., and Kanber does not render unpatentable these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 37 and 38 ultimately depend from claim 22 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 22. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Tsang et al., and Nakao et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 22. Kanber is not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Tsang et al., and Nakao et al. Indeed, Kanber does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Tsang et al., and Nakao et al.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Nakao et al., Tsang et al., and Kanber does not render unpatentable the present claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

V. Rejection of Claim 45 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Tsang et al., and U.S. Patent No. 5,901,050 (“Imai”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Tsang et al., and Imai does not render unpatentable claim 45 for at least the following reasons.

Claim 45 depends from claim 22 and therefore includes all of the features recited in claim 22. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al. and Tsang et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 22. Imai is not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Tsang et al. Indeed, Imai does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Tsang et al.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Tsang et al., and Imai does not render unpatentable claim 45. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VI. Rejection of Claims 29, 30, 40, and 41 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 29, 30, 40, and 41 Claim 45 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Tsang et al., and U.S. Patent No. 6,328,342 (“Belousov et al.”). It is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Tsang et al., and Belousov et al. does not render unpatentable these claims for at least the following reasons.

Claims 29, 30, 40, and 41 ultimately depend from claim 22 and therefore include all of the features recited in claim 22. As more fully set forth above, the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Tsang et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, all of the features recited in claim 22. Belousov et al. is not relied upon for disclosing or suggesting the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Tsang et al. Indeed, Belousov et al. does not disclose, or even suggest, the features of claim 22 not disclosed or suggested by the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., and Tsang et al.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the combination of Geusic et al., Wen et al., Tsang et al., and Belousov et al. does not render unpatentable the present claims. Accordingly, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

VII. Conclusion

It is therefore respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, an early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 2, 2009

/Clifford A. Ulrich/
By: Clifford A. Ulrich (Reg. No. 42,194) for:
Gerard A. Messina
Reg. No. 35,952

KENYON & KENYON LLP
One Broadway
New York, New York 10004
(212) 425-7200
CUSTOMER NO. 26646